

## Message

**From:** Berkoff, Michael [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F347C01A92D7424FA840C24F6B7FBF6B-MBERKOFF]  
**Sent:** 12/30/2014 4:29:11 PM  
**To:** Rowan, Anne [rowan.anne@epa.gov]  
**CC:** Arcaute, Francisco [Arcaute.Francisco@epa.gov]; Russell, Diane [russell.diane@epa.gov]; Saric, James [saric.james@epa.gov]; Frey, Rebecca [frey.rebecca@epa.gov]; Kelley, Jeff [kelley.jeff@epa.gov]  
**Subject:** RE: Allied site - city proposed compromise - media inquiry

So, Cisco and I can just call her back?

---

**From:** Rowan, Anne  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:15 AM  
**To:** Berkoff, Michael  
**Cc:** Arcaute, Francisco; Russell, Diane; Saric, James; Frey, Rebecca; Kelley, Jeff  
**Subject:** Re: Allied site - city proposed compromise - media inquiry

Yes!

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 30, 2014, at 9:53 AM, "Berkoff, Michael" <[berkoff.michael@epa.gov](mailto:berkoff.michael@epa.gov)> wrote:

I thought that we dealt with this by doing the desk statement. Wasn't that the way to get the go ahead to respond to reporters?

---

**From:** Arcaute, Francisco  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 30, 2014 9:44 AM  
**To:** Berkoff, Michael; Rowan, Anne; Russell, Diane  
**Cc:** Saric, James; Frey, Rebecca  
**Subject:** RE: Allied site - city proposed compromise - media inquiry

Let me first check how the RA would want to respond.

Thanks

F

---

**From:** Berkoff, Michael  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 30, 2014 9:42 AM  
**To:** Arcaute, Francisco; Rowan, Anne; Russell, Diane  
**Cc:** Saric, James; Frey, Rebecca  
**Subject:** FW: Allied site - city proposed compromise - media inquiry

All,

I am back in the office. Can we respond to this reporter? I'd like to, so that we can support the city during this rollout.

1. We have taken part in the discussions with MDEQ and the city. They have been a true three party partnership.
2. We plan to add an additional option to the FS *after* we show a couple new configurations to citizens and get their input.

3. The dates for the Proposed Plan and the ROD will depend upon the timing of joint (EPA, MDEQ and city of Kalamazoo) community outreach over the coming months.

Michael

**From:** Lindsey Smith [<mailto:lmsmi@umich.edu>]

**Sent:** Monday, December 22, 2014 1:29 PM

**To:** Arcaute, Francisco

**Cc:** Rowan, Anne; Berkoff, Michael

**Subject:** Re: Allied site - city proposed compromise - media inquiry

Thanks! I'm supposed to write about it today. So even a written statement would help if there's no time for an interview. Basically would want to know - if yes, EPA is taking part in discussions about a different option for the Allied site. How would adding a new option into consideration work in the EPA's superfund process? I heard last the ROD on this OU would likely be out in Fall 2015. Is that correct? Would this proposal delay that process at all? Best~

On Mon, Dec 22, 2014 at 2:08 PM, Arcaute, Francisco <[Arcaute.Francisco@epa.gov](mailto:Arcaute.Francisco@epa.gov)> wrote:

Lindsey. I'm out today. I'm looping in Anne Rowan to see how we can assist you. What's your deadline? Happy holidays. F

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 22, 2014, at 12:27 PM, "Lindsey Smith" <[lmsmi@umich.edu](mailto:lmsmi@umich.edu)> wrote:

Hi Francisco,

I'm writing about the city of Kalamazoo backing away from total removal for the Allied site. It put out a press release that's it is proposing a compromise. Is there any chance that the EPA would redo its feasibility study to include such an option? If you could, please let me know either way.

Thanks!

All the best,

--

Lindsey Smith  
West Michigan Reporter  
Michigan Radio  
Office (616) 551-0717  
[michiganradio.org](http://michiganradio.org)

--

Lindsey Smith  
West Michigan Reporter  
Michigan Radio  
Office (616) 551-0717  
[michiganradio.org](http://michiganradio.org)